



SA.(MD).Nos.108 to 110 of 2021

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

RESERVED ON : 10.03.2022

DELIVERED ON : 04 .07.2022

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE R.VIJAYAKUMAR

S.A.(MD).Nos.108, 109 and 110 of 2021
and CMP(MD).No. 1765, 1766 and 1767 of 2021

M.Padma

...Appellant/Appellant
/Plaintiff in SA.No.108 of 2021

...Appellant/Respondent
/Defendant in SA.No.109 of 2021

..Appellant/Respondent
/Plaintiff in SA.No.110 of 2021

Vs

V.Veeramani

...Respondent/Respondent
/Defendant in SA.No.108 of 2021

...Respondent/Appellant
/Plaintiff in SA.No.109 of 2021

..Respondent/Appellant
/Defendant in SA.No.110 of 2021



SA.(MD).Nos.108 to 110 of 2021

PRAYER in SA(MD).No.108 of 2021: Second Appeal is filed under Section 100 of Civil Procedure Code, to set aside the judgment and decree passed in A.S.No.56 of 2018 dated 06.11.2019 on the file of the Principal District Court, Tirunelveli confirming the judgment and decree passed by the Additional Subordinate Court, Tirunelveli in O.S.No.158 of 2013 dated 24.08.2017 and to allow the second appeal.

PRAYER in SA(MD).No.109 of 2021: Second Appeal is filed under Section 100 of Civil Procedure Code, to set aside the judgment and decree passed in A.S.No.6 of 2018 dated 06.11.2019 on the file of the Principal District Court, Tirunelveli reversing the judgment and decree passed by the Additional Subordinate Court, Tirunelveli in O.S.No.238 of 2010 dated 24.08.2017 and to allow the second appeal.

PRAYER in SA(MD).No.110 of 2021: Second Appeal is filed under Section 100 of Civil Procedure Code, to set aside the judgment and decree passed in A.S.No.7 of 2018 dated 06.11.2019 on the file of the Principal District Court, Tirunelveli reversing the judgment and decree passed by the Additional Subordinate Court, Tirunelveli in O.S.No.240 of 2013 dated 24.08.2017.

(In all the appeals)

For Appellant : Mr.Veera Kathiravan
Senior Counsel
For M/s.Veera Associates

For Respondent : Mr.V.Meenakshi Sundaram
For Mr.D.Nallathambi



WEB COPY



SA.(MD).Nos.108 to 110 of 2021

COMMON JUDGMENT

S.A(MD).No.108 of 2021:

The plaintiff is the appellant.

2.The plaintiff had filed O.S.No.158 of 2013 before the Additional Subordinate Court, Tirunelveli for the relief of specific performance of an agreement dated 21.03.2001 said to have been executed by the defendant. The trial Court dismissed the suit. The plaintiff had filed A.S.No.56 of 2018 before the Principal District Court, Tirunelveli. The learned District Judge concurred with the findings of the trial Court and dismissed the appeal. As against the concurrent findings, the present second appeal has been filed by the plaintiff.

S.A(MD).No.109 of 2021

3.The defendant is the appellant.

4.The plaintiff had filed O.S.No.238 of 2010 before the Additional Subordinate Court, Tirunelveli for the relief of declaration of title and for recovery of possession. The said suit was dismissed by the trial Court. The plaintiff had filed A.S.No.6 of 2018 before the Principal District Court, Tirunelveli. The learned District Judge was pleased to allow the



SA.(MD).Nos.108 to 110 of 2021

appeal and decreed the suit. As against the same, the defendant had filed the above second appeal.

S.A(MD).No.110 of 2021:

5.The plaintiff is the appellant.

6.The plaintiff had filed O.S.No.240 of 2013 before the Additional Subordinate Court, Tirunelveli for the relief of permanent injunction restraining the defendant from disturbing the plaintiff's peaceful possession and enjoyment of the suit schedule property. The suit was decreed by the trial Court. The defendant had filed A.S.No.7 of 2018 before the Principal District Court, Tirunelveli. The learned District Judge was pleased to reverse the judgment and decree of the trial Court and dismissed the suit. As against the same, the plaintiff has filed the above second appeal.

Consolidated Pleadings:

7.S.A.(MD).No.108 of 2021 arises out of a suit for specific performance filed by one Padma as against her former husband Veeramani. According to the plaintiff, she got married to the defendant on 26.08.1987. At the time of marriage, the plaintiff was working as a Scientific Assistant Grade-II in a Regional Forensic Centre and the



SA.(MD).Nos.108 to 110 of 2021

defendant was working as a Senior Inspector in Co-operative Department at Tirunelveli. The plaintiff had further contended that both of them were living together up to April-2003 and thereafter, a matrimonial dispute arose between them.

8.The plaintiff had further contended that the defendant/husband had filed H.M.O.P.No.66 of 2003 before the Sub Court, Tirunelveli seeking the relief of divorce and the plaintiff/wife had filed H.M.O.P.No. 72 of 2003 for restitution of conjugal rights. After a joint trial, the prayer for divorce was rejected and the prayer for restitution of conjugal rights was decreed. As against the same, the defendant/husband had filed H.M.C.M.A.Nos.53 and 54 of 2005 before the I Additional District Court, Tirunelveli. The learned District Judge was pleased to allow both the appeals on 03.04.2006 and granted divorce between the parties after dismissing the prayer of the wife for restitution of conjugal rights. As against the same, the plaintiff/wife had filed CMSA.Nos.25 and 26 of 2006 before the High Court. The judgment and decree of the District Court were confirmed by the High Court on 13.04.2010.



SA.(MD).Nos.108 to 110 of 2021

9.The plaintiff had further contended that the vacant site of the suit schedule property was originally allotted in the name of the defendant by N.G.O. Co-operative Housing Society. Though the sale consideration was fixed at Rs.6,552/- , the said amount was paid only by the plaintiff. The plaintiff had further contended that the defendant has borrowed a sum of Rs.2,00,000/- as housing loan from the said Society and created a mortgage to the said Society on 08.11.1995 with regard to the suit schedule property.

10.The plaintiff had further contended that the said amount of Rs.2,00,000/- was insufficient for the construction of the ground floor and hence, the plaintiff has spent a sum of Rs.1,50,000/- from her income and the ground floor was completed in the year 1996. Thereafter, for the construction of the first floor, the plaintiff has contributed another sum of Rs.4,50,000/- after pledging her jewels in the Co-operative Bank and drawn amount from her Provident Fund and also borrowed loan from the Co-operative Thrift Society. That apart, the plaintiff's father had contributed Rs.50,000/- and the plaintiff's sister has contributed another sum of Rs.20,000/- for construction of the first floor. Totally, the plaintiff



SA.(MD).Nos.108 to 110 of 2021

has spent Rs.6,00,000/- for the construction of the ground floor and the first floor and a sum of Rs.8,500/- for purchasing the plot.

11.The plaintiff had further contended that in view of the matrimonial dispute, the defendant had agreed to execute either a settlement deed or some other documents in favour of the plaintiff on condition that the plaintiff should clear all the loan amount. To that effect, the defendant had executed Exhibit B13 document on 21.03.2001 in favour of the plaintiff. Under the said document, the defendant had agreed to execute a registered document in favour of the plaintiff after the plaintiff has discharged the entire loan amount.

12.The plaintiff had further contended that the plaintiff has discharged the entire loan amount. According to the plaintiff, she also paid a sum of Rs.3,09,761/- to N.G.O. Co-operative Housing Society on 30.09.2012. Hence, according to the plaintiff, she has fulfilled all the conditions mentioned in Exhibit B13 agreement, but the defendant is refusing to execute any document in her favour. She had further contended that the defendant is attempting to evict her in order to deprive



SA.(MD).Nos.108 to 110 of 2021

the plaintiff of her rights. The plaintiff had further contended that right from the day one of completion of construction of the disputed property, she is in possession of the same. Hence, she prayed that the defendant shall be directed to execute a sale deed in her favour. She had prayed for a decree for permanent injunction in O.S.No.240 of 2013.

13.The defendant filed a written statement specific performance suit and permanent injunction suit contending that he was not living along with his wife and there is no connection whatsoever with the plaintiff after November 1998. He had further contended that the entire amount for allotment of the Housing site was paid by him. The defendant had further contended that the loan amount was regularly paid only by the defendant. The building plan approval was placed only in the name of the defendant and the entire construction was completed only by the defendant and the plaintiff has not spent any money either for purchasing the plot or for construction of the house property.

14.The defendant had further contended that the agreement dated 21.03.2001 was obtained under undue influence and coercion. Hence, the said agreement is not enforceable. He had further contended that due to



SA.(MD).Nos.108 to 110 of 2021

non-payment of instalments, the Society has initiated Arbitration Proceedings as against the defendant and an exparte award was passed on 30.05.2007 for a sum of Rs.3,49,538/-. As against the same, the defendant had preferred C.M.A (CS).No.49 of 2008 before the Principal District Court, Tirunelveli where an order of stay of operation of award has been granted. When the said appeal was pending before the Principal District Court, Tirunelveli, with the connivance of the authorities of the Housing Society, the plaintiff has chosen to pay a sum of Rs.3,09,761/-. Any payment made by the plaintiff will not affect the right of the defendant in the suit schedule property.

15.The defendant had further contended that the possession of the plaintiff is only permissive in nature and she is in possession only as the wife of the defendant. The possession is not traceable to any agreement much less the agreement dated 21.03.2001. According to the defendant, the alleged agreement dated 21.03.2001, is perse illegal and unenforceable. He had further contended that the suit is barred by limitation and there is no cause of action for filing the said suit. The husband as plaintiff in O.S.No.238 of 2010 had prayed for declaration of title and recovery of possession from the wife.



SA.(MD).Nos.108 to 110 of 2021

Findings of the Trial Court and Appellate Court:

16.The trial Court after considering the oral and documentary evidence, arrived at a finding that the defendant has in fact executed Exhibit B13 agreement in favour of the plaintiff. The plaintiff had produced records to the effect that she had repaid the loan borrowed by the defendant. The trial Court further held that though the defendant has claimed that Exhibit B13 agreement was obtained by undue influence and coercion, the defendant has not taken any steps to prove the same. But, the trial Court dismissed the suit for specific performance on the ground that the plaintiff has not established the fact that she has spent around Rs.6,00,000/- for construction of the suit schedule property. The trial Court further found that both the parties have not approached the Court with proper clarity with regard to the fact that under what circumstances Exhibit B13 agreement was executed by the defendant. Based upon the said findings, the trial Court dismissed the suit for permanent injunction. The trial Court decreed the suit for permanent injunction filed by the wife and dismissed the suit for declaration of title and recovery of possession filed by the husband.



SA.(MD).Nos.108 to 110 of 2021

17.The First Appellate Court concurred with the findings of the trial Court with regard to the fact that the plaintiff has not proved regarding her contribution for construction of the suit schedule property. The First Appellate Court further found that the defendant has disputed the agreement way back in January 2006. However, the present suit for specific performance has been filed only in August 2013. Hence, the suit is barred by limitation. Based upon the said findings, the First Appellate Court confirmed the judgment and decree of the trial Court in the specific performance suit. As against the concurrent findings, the present second appeal has been filed by the plaintiff. The Appellate Court dismissed the suit for permanent injunction filed by the wife and decreed the suit for declaration of title and recovery of possession filed by the husband.

Contentions of the Counsel for the Appellant (Wife):

18.The learned Senior Counsel appearing for the appellant had contended that the trial Court as well as the First Appellate Court have not properly appreciated the fact that the plaintiff has established that she has contributed so much of amount to the construction of the suit schedule property. The learned Senior Counsel has referred to Exhibit B1 under which the plaintiff has deposited a sum of Rs.3,09,761/- on



SA.(MD).Nos.108 to 110 of 2021

30.09.2012. The learned Senior Counsel also referred to Exhibit B2 under which the plaintiff has drawn amount from her Provident Fund to meet out the construction expenses. He had also relied upon Exhibit B14 under which again the plaintiff has drawn money from her Provident Account. Under Exhibit B15, the plaintiff has borrowed loan from the Co-operative Thrift Society. Series of 54 receipts marked as Exhibit B17 will clearly indicate that the plaintiff had pledged her jewels and used the said money for construction of the suit schedule property. The learned Senior Counsel also relied Exhibit B18 which is a certificate issued by the authorities wherein it is indicated that the plaintiff has deposited a sum of Rs.20,000/- for the loan standing in the name of the defendant. Exhibits B20 and B21 will also indicate that the plaintiff has pledged her jewels and borrowed money to meet out the construction expenses. Hence, he contended that the Courts below had not properly appreciated these documents and have arrived at an erroneous finding that the plaintiff has not established the fact that she has contributed for construction of the building. The learned Senior Counsel further contended that though there was some matrimonial dispute from the year 1989 onwards, they have been living together as husband and wife at



SA.(MD).Nos.108 to 110 of 2021

least till 1998. Thereafter, the husband started living in the first floor of the building till 2003. In the year 2001, the husband has executed two documents one under Exhibit B19 agreeing to convey the property in favour of the plaintiff. Thereafter, under Exhibit B13, a fresh agreement was entered into on 21.03.2001 under which the defendant has directed the plaintiff to discharge the entire loan amount. Thereafter, the defendant had agreed to execute a document in favour of the plaintiff. According to the learned Senior Counsel, all the payments were made by the plaintiff only pursuant to the agreement under Exhibit B13. Once the plaintiff has fulfilled all her obligations as per Exhibit B13 agreement, thereafter, the defendant cannot go back on his assurance to execute a document in favour of the plaintiff. In fact, the defendant has contributed a major portion of her income borrowing money as well as by pledging her jewels for construction of the suit schedule building.

19.The learned Senior Counsel appearing for the appellant had further contended that though the defendant had raised a plea that Exhibits B19 and B13 were executed by undue influence and coercion, at no point of time, the defendant has taken any steps to declare them as



SA.(MD).Nos.108 to 110 of 2021

void documents or cancel the said documents. Based upon the documents of the year 2001, the suit has been filed in the year 2013. Till such period, the defendant has not initiated any actions challenging the said document, though he is aware of the execution of the said document which were projected by the plaintiff in the matrimonial proceedings.

20.The learned Senior Counsel had further contended that as per the Clause in Exhibit B13 agreement only after discharging the entire loan amount, the plaintiff would be entitled to a document in her favour. The entire loan amount was discharged under Exhibit B1 dated 30.09.2012 and the suit has been filed on 05.08.2013 and hence, the First Appellate court was not right in holding that the suit is barred by limitation. When the plaintiff has established her readiness and willingness by paying all the loan amount and proved the validity of Exhibit B13 sale agreement, she is entitled to a decree as prayed for.

Contentions of the Counsel for the Respondent (Husband):

21.Per contra, the learned counsel for the respondent had contended that Exhibit B13 agreement was executed by the defendant



SA.(MD).Nos.108 to 110 of 2021

under undue influence and coercion of the plaintiff. He had further contended that the plaintiff threatened to commit suicide and only under the said threat, Exhibit B13 document came to be executed.

22.The learned counsel for the respondent had further contended that the defendant has disputed the document while filing his written statement in O.S.No.715 of 2009 (O.S.No.240 of 2013). The said written statement was filed in January 2010 in which the defendant had challenged the validity of the said document and hence, it would amount to refusal to execute a document. The present suit for specific performance has been filed on 05.08.2013 beyond a period of three years and hence, it barred in view of Article 54 of the Limitation Act.

23.The learned counsel for the appellant had further contended that the Co-operative Society has refused to receive the instalments that were attempted to be paid by her. However, under Exhibit B18, the plaintiff had deposited a sum of Rs.20,000/-. The plaintiff has not produced any document or oral evidence to establish that the Co-operative Society has refused to receive the monthly instalment. The plaintiff has chosen to



SA.(MD).Nos.108 to 110 of 2021

deposit the amount only after a period of 11 years from the date of Exhibit B13 agreement. Hence, the plaintiff has not explained the delay of the said 11 years.

24.The learned counsel for the respondent had further contended that the plaintiff had contributed for purchase of the plot and construction of the building. However, both the Courts below have concurrently found that the plaintiff has not established her contribution towards purchase of the plot or construction of the building. When the plaintiff has not established the above said facts, there is no consideration whatsoever for Exhibit B13 agreement. Hence, he prayed for dismissal of the second appeal.

25.I have carefully considered the submissions made by both counsels.

Discussion:

26.The plaintiff has filed the present suit for specific performance of the agreement dated 21.03.2001 marked as Exhibit B13 under which the defendant is said to have agreed to execute a document in favour of the plaintiff.



SA.(MD).Nos.108 to 110 of 2021

27.A perusal of Exhibit B13 document discloses the following

facts:

(i).The vacant site was allotted in the name of the defendant on 30.01.1987 and the entire cost of the said vacant site was paid by the defendant.

(ii).A sale deed has been executed by the Co-operative Society in favour of the defendant.

(iii).The defendant has borrowed a sum of Rs.2,00,000/- from the said Co-operative Society after creating a mortgage of the vacant site.

(iv).The construction has been completed using the housing loan amount from the Co-operative Society, borrowal from GPF, jewel loan and their salaries (husband and wife)

(v).The total extent of the construction is 1550 sq.ft consisting of ground floor, first floor and second floor and the construction was completed in December 1998.

(vi).The total cost of construction is Rs.5.50 lakhs.

(vii).The defendant had conveyed his full right of the house property along with vacant site in favour of the plaintiff.

(viii).The defendant had agreed to execute a document in favour of



SA.(MD).Nos.108 to 110 of 2021

the plaintiff provided the plaintiff discharges the Co-operative Housing Loan of Rs.2,00,000/-.

(ix).The plaintiff should also discharge the jewel loan and other loans.

Validity and Enforceability of Exhibit B13:

28.A perusal of the above said recitals in the agreement will disclose that the defendant had agreed to execute some kind of documents in favour of the plaintiff, once the plaintiff has discharged the entire loan obtained for construction of the house. However, the nature of document that is to be executed by the defendant has not been specifically mentioned. The plaintiff in Paragraph No.7 of the plaint has also stated that the defendant had agreed to execute a settlement deed or any other document in favour of the plaintiff after discharging of the loan. However, the prayer in the plaint is for a direction to the defendant to execute a sale deed in favour of the plaintiff. When Exhibit B13 agreement is not clear about the nature of the document that is to be executed by the defendant in future, the plaintiff cannot pray for a direction for execution of a sale deed in her favour. Even as per Para No. 7 of the plaint, the understanding between the parties was that the



SA.(MD).Nos.108 to 110 of 2021

defendant may either execute a settlement deed or any other document (there is no specific mention about the sale deed) . Hence, Exhibit B13 document is ambiguous to the nature of the document that is to be executed by the defendant in future. When there is an ambiguity in the very nature of the document to be executed, Exhibit B13 agreement is not legally enforceable. It is clear that there was no consensus ad idem between the parties to the agreement even with regard to the nature of the document that should be executed. Hence, Exhibit B13 agreement suffers from ambiguity and not enforceable in the eye of law.

29.The defendant has complained about vitiating factors under which Exhibit B13 agreement came to be executed. However, the defendant has not chosen to challenge the said document within the period of limitation. The defendant has also admitted the execution of the document.

Limitation:

30.The defendant has raised dispute with regard to the enforceability of the document and refused to execute a document in favour of the plaintiff in the written statement filed in O.S.No.240 of



SA.(MD).Nos.108 to 110 of 2021

2013 filed in January 2010. That apart, in Para No.7 of the plaint, the plaintiff herself has admitted that a legal notice has been issued by her on 18.01.2006 that her husband is unlawfully attempting to evict her from the property. The plaintiff has also made paper publication on 02.09.2006 and 03.10.2006 in reply to the defendant's publication to the effect that the plaintiff was attempting to make encumbrance in the schedule of property. All the above said facts will clearly show that at least from October 2006 onwards, the defendant was refusing to execute the document pursuant to Exhibit B13 agreement. The present suit having been filed on 05.08.2013 clearly barred under Article 54 of Limitation Act. Hence, the First Appellate Court cannot be found fault with for arriving at a finding that the present suit for specific performance is barred by limitation.

Contribution made by the wife:

31.Even as per Exhibit B13 agreement, the cost for purchasing the plot was paid by the defendant. Hence, the plaintiff who is relying upon Exhibit B13 agreement cannot turn around and contend that she had paid the cost for the plot. The plaintiff has produced Exhibit B1 receipt issued by the Co-operative Housing Society to the effect that she had paid a sum



SA.(MD).Nos.108 to 110 of 2021

of Rs.3,09,761/- on 30.09.2012. Though this payment has been made pending suit for declaration of title filed by the defendant, payment made by the plaintiff cannot be disputed.

32.The plaintiff has further claimed that she had spent over Rs.6,00,000/- towards construction of the building and total cost incurred by her would be around Rs.10,00,000/- . The plaintiff has produced Exhibit B2, GPF loan account. She has also produced Exhibits B14 to B21 to establish the fact that she has borrowed loan from GPF, Thrift Society and jewel loan in order to put up construction. In total, the plaintiff claims that she has spent around Rs.10,00,000/- for construction of the building.

33.Exhibit B13 agreement dated 21.03.2001 discloses that the total cost of the building up to the second floor is Rs.5.50 lakhs. The plaintiff has produced Exhibit A7 which is a departmental proceedings initiated against him under Rule 17(A) of Tamil Nadu Civil Services (Discipline and Appeal) Rules for not obtaining prior permission for putting up construction. In Exhibit A7, an order has been passed imposing a punishment of censure as against the defendant for not



SA.(MD).Nos.108 to 110 of 2021

obtaining permission for construction of the house property. In the said proceedings, the Deputy Registrar of Co-operative Society at Cheranmahadevi has arrived at a conclusion that the defendant had borrowed a sum of Rs.4.55 lakhs from various institutions and has put up a construction. The value of the building has been assessed by way of competent Engineer to an extent of Rs.4.55 lakhs.

34.A perusal of Exhibit A7 will indicate that the defendant has borrowed from various institutions to an extent of Rs.4.55 laksh and it includes a sum of Rs.2,00,000/- borrowed from NGO Co-operative Housing Society. Out of this Rs.4.55 lakhs, a sum of Rs.,2,00,000/- borrowed from NGO Co-operative Housing Society was not paid regularly and it was closed by the plaintiff by paying a sum of Rs. 3,09,761/- on 30th November 2012 under Exhibit B1. Hence, we can safely arrive at a conclusion that the defendant has contributed Rs.2.55 lakhs (excluding Rs.2,00,000/- borrowed from NGO Co-operative Housing Society Ltd.,) towards construction of the building.

35.The value of the building as agreed by the parties as per Exhibit B13 is Rs.5.50 lakhs. Out of the said amount, the contribution of the



SA.(MD).Nos.108 to 110 of 2021

husband is Rs.2.55 lakhs. Hence, as on date of Exhibit B13, the contribution of the wife would be Rs.2.95 lakhs. Admittedly, the wife has cleared the Co-operative Society Loan to a tune of about Rs.3,09,761/- . When these amounts are put together, the total value of contribution of the wife is Rs.6,04,761/-. The Courts below have not properly appreciated the documents produced on the side of the plaintiff to prove her contribution for construction of the house property.

Title and Possession:

36.The wife has not claimed any share in the suit schedule property based upon her contribution for construction of the house. She had only prayed for a direction to the husband for execution of a sale deed in her favour. Unless the plaintiff admits the title of the defendant, she cannot pray for execution of a sale deed from the defendant. Hence, this Court can safely arrive at a conclusion that the plaintiff has admitted the absolute title of the defendant over the house property.

37.Admittedly, the husband had purchased the plot utilising his own funds even as per Exhibit B13. The defendant has also applied for building plan approval in his own name. The title to a property always



SA.(MD).Nos.108 to 110 of 2021

vests with the registered owner of the property and any claim contrary to the same, would not be legally sustainable, unless the claimant pleads adverse possession. In the present case, the plaintiff is admittedly in possession of the property from the year 1996 in the capacity as the wife of the defendant. The said possession could only be construed to be a permissive possession. Hence, there cannot be any impediment for this Court to arrive at a conclusion that the defendant is the absolute owner of the schedule mentioned property and entitled to a decree for recovery of possession.

38.The plaintiff had cleared the loan of the Co-operative Society only based upon Exhibit B13 agreement. Hence,the plaintiff is construed to have entered into shoes of the creditor and she will be legally entitled to recover the amount spent towards construction of the house property. The defendant though is the owner of the property, the plaintiff is continuing in possession of the said property based upon the relationship as his wife. The relationship has been severed by way of a divorce decree dated 03.04.2006 and she will not be entitled to continue in possession of the suit schedule property. However, the defendant in specific



SA.(MD).Nos.108 to 110 of 2021

performance suit and the plaintiff in O.S.No.238 of 2010 (suit for declaration of title and recovery of possession) will not be entitled to execute the decree for recovery of possession, unless he has deposited the amount spent by his former wife to the account of O.S.No.238 of 2010 on the file of the Additional Subordinate Court, Tirunelveli.

39.In view of the above said discussion;

(1).S.A.(MD).No.108 of 2021 arising out of a suit for specific performance is dismissed by confirming the judgment and decree of the Courts below.

(2).S.A(MD).No.110 of 2021 arising out of a suit for permanent injunction filed by the wife is also dismissed by confirming the judgment and decree of the First Appellate Court.

(3).SA(MD).No.109 of 2021 arising out of a suit for declaration of title and recovery of possession filed by the husband is also dismissed by confirming the judgement and decree of the First Appellate Court. However, the respondent/husband will not be entitled to execute the decree for recovery of possession, unless he deposits a sum of Rs.2,95,000/- with 6% Simple Interest from 21.03.2001 till the date of



SA.(MD).Nos.108 to 110 of 2021

deposit. The husband shall further deposit a sum of Rs.3,09,761/- with 6% Simple Interest from 30.09.2012 till the date of deposit.

40. The Second Appeals are dismissed on the ground that no substantial questions of law arises for consideration. However, the decree for recovery of possession can be executed by the respondent (husband) in SA(MD).No.109 of 2021 only after the deposit of the amounts as stated supra. No costs. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petitions are closed.

04 .07.2022

Index : Yes / No
Internet : Yes / No
msa

To

- 1.The Principal District Judge
Tirunelveli
- 2.The Additional Subordinate Judge
Tirunelveli
- 3.The Section Officer,
V.R.Section,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.

26/27



WEB COPY



SA.(MD).Nos.108 to 110 of 2021

R.VIJAYAKUMAR,J.

msa

Pre-delivery Common Judgment made in
S.A.(MD).Nos.108, 109 and 110 of 2021
and CMP(MD).No. 1765, 1766 and 1767 of 2021

04.07.2022